

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

II. REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application and the Office Action mailed on January 9, 2008 rejected Claims 1-18. The Office Action also objected to the specification because the claim of priority of the PCT in the specification failed to disclose the filing date of Australian provisional patent application no. 2003904507.

Please note that Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the issues were raised in the Office Action for the convenience and reference of the Examiner. In addition, Applicant requests that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner. Further, the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any particular reference and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and that reference.

A. Response to the Objection to the Specification

The Office Action stated that the claim of priority of the PCT in the specification is objected to for failure to disclose the filing date of Australian provisional patent application no. 2003904507.

As set forth above, Applicant amended the specification to include the filing date of Australian provisional patent application no. 2003904507. Accordingly, Applicant requests that this objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

B. Response to the Section 102(b) Rejection

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-9, 11 and 14-15 as being anticipated by U.S. patent publication no. 2002/0078007 by Herrero. The Office Action stated, for claim 1, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system for enabling a user to create at least one task (Abstract), the system comprising: a host server for hosting task pages once they have been created ([0029], lines 2-6, a host computer 110 and its associated database server 118 and webs server 116 are disclosed);

at least one user computer running a browser program operable by at least one user to access task pages hosted by said host server that said at least one user has permission to access ([0030, browsers 126-128 access host computer 110 for purpose of manipulating and interacting with to-do lists); and

a task creator configured to create a task record in response to a command from an initiating user, the task record including a task universal resource indicator (uri) for each new task whereby said host server can create a task page from said task record that can be accessed using said task uri ([0040], options menu 410 allows user to add/edit projects whose properties are stored on host computer 110).

The Office Action stated for Claim 2, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said system comprises a plurality of user computers

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

([0030], lines 1-2, browsers 126-128).

The Office Action stated for Claim 3, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 2, wherein said task creator is configured to allow the initiating user to specify at least one additional user for a task and to create an association record specifying the initiating user and any additional users specified by the initiating user, the association record defining the users who have permission to access the task page ([0051], disclosure of user creating tasks at step 340 and selecting users, i.e. contacts, to associate with this task at step 342).

The Office Action stated for Claim 4, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the task creator is configured to dispatch a message including the task uri to the at least one additional user to thereby inform the at least one additional user of the task whereafter the at least one additional user can access said task page using a browser program run by the additional user's user computer ([0035], host computer 110 keeps users apprised through messages sent via a variety of means).

The Office Action stated for Claim 5, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 4, comprising e-mail messaging means whereby the message dispatched is an e-mail message ([0035], host computer disclosed to send messages via mail server 122).

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

The Office Action stated for Claim 6, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 4, comprising SMS messaging means whereby the message dispatched is an SMS message ([0035], host computer disclosed to send messages via wireless means to devices such as cell phones).

The Office Action stated for Claim 7, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the task creator is a task creation program run by said host server which is operable using the browser program run by the initiating user's user computer ([0030], host computer 110 maintains a to-do list which is accessible via browser by browsers 126-128).

The Office Action stated for Claim 8, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said task creator allows an initiating user to add at least one subject uri of at least one subject page to the task record, whereafter the task page includes the at least one subject uri whereby users can access the subject page from the task page ([0031], lines 1-8, disclosure of items (tasks) being associated with a project, as well as disclosure of items being presented in sorted form from within browser).

The Office Action stated for Claim 9, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, wherein a task creation uri is placed on a subject page and the

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

initiating user sends a command to said task creator by selecting the task creation uri whereafter the task creator creates a task record including the uri of the subject uri ([0040], disclosure of interface 400 allowing for creation of tasks and projects).

The Office Action stated for Claim 11, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a task creation uri stored in a uri record of an initiating user's browser, whereby when viewing a subject page an initiating user sends a command to said task creator by selecting the task creation uri from the uri record whereafter the task creator creates a task record including the subject uri ([0031], lines 1-4, disclosure of system allowing user, via browser interface, to add to-do items, i.e. subjects, to a task, i.e. project).

The Office Action stated for Claim 14, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising an event creator for creating events associated with a task ([0031], lines 1-4).

The Office Action stated for Claim 15, the Herrero reference teaches:

A system as claimed in claim 14, wherein an event may be created from the task page ([0040], lines 1-4).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of Claims 1-9, 11 and 14-15 because the Herrero reference does not disclose each and element of these claims. Briefly, the Herrero reference

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

is directed towards a task management program allows a user to create contact, project and task records that are stored in a database. Abstract. The Herrero reference explains that a method of operating a task management system begins by establishing an account for a first user. ¶ [0009]. In greater detail, the Herrero reference states: “The task management system then receives a plurality of contacts for various team members into a database from the existing user. The task management system saves each of the contacts as records that include a unique e-mail address. The task management system then receives a project into the database from the existing user. The project is saved as a record that includes a project name and is associated with the existing user. The task management system then receives tasks into the database from the existing user. The existing user assigns each of the tasks to a project and to two or more contacts. Each of the tasks are saved as records that include a project field and contact fields. The task management system then transmits periodic reminders related to the tasks. The periodic reminders are directed to the contact's e-mail addresses. The task management system then receives a request from a new user to establish an account in the database. The new user has received one of the periodic reminders in an e-mail account associated with the new user's e-mail address. The task management system then transmits an authorization code to the new user. The authorization code is directed to the new user's e-mail address. The task management system then receives the authorization code from the new user. Finally, the task management system presents a pending task to the new user.” ¶ [0009]

The Herrero reference, however, does not disclose each and every element of Claim 1. For example, the Herrero reference does not disclose (1) a host server for hosting task pages once they

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

have been created; (2) at least one user computer running a browser program operable by at least one user to access task pages hosted by said host server that said at least one user has permission to access; and (3) a task creator configured to create a task record in response to a command from an initiating user, the task record including a task universal resource indicator (uri) for each new task whereby said host server can create a task page from said task record that can be accessed using said task uri.

In conclusion, the Herrero reference does not disclose each and every element of Claim 1. The Herrero reference also does not disclose each and every element of Claims 2-9, 11 and 14-15. In addition, Claims 2-9, 11 and 14-15 should also be allowable at least because these claims are dependent upon Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request that this Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 1-9, 11 and 14-15 be withdrawn.

C. Response to the First Section 103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Herrero reference in view of U.S. patent no. 5,754,306 issued to Taylor, et al.

The Office Action stated for Claim 10, the Herrero reference teaches “A system as claimed in claim 9.” The Office Action acknowledged that the Herrero reference fails to disclose the limitation “further comprising automatically adding an additional user to the task record.”

The Office Action, however, stated the Taylor patent discloses an email communication system that automatically fills in default values for recipients after a user creates an email (col. 13,

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

lines 61-62). The Office Action asserts that the Herrero reference and Taylor patent are analogous art because both are from the field of user communication across a network.

The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the Herrero reference with a method of filling default values for recipients/community members, as taught by Taylor, because this modification allows for increased productivity and less repetitive steps in issuing posting to a project management site.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of Claim 10 because the Herrero reference and Taylor patent, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose each and element of Claim 10. Claim 10, however, should be allowable at least because this claim is dependent upon Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request that this Section 103(a) rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

D. Response to the Second Section 103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejected Claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Herrero reference in view of U.S. patent no. 7,159,178 issued to Vogt.

The Office Action stated, for Claim 12, the Herrero reference teaches “A system as claimed in claim 1.” The Office Action acknowledges that the Herrero reference fails to disclose the limitation “wherein said host server hosts a home page for each user.”

The Office Action, however, stated the Vogt patent discloses a communication system for managing a community of participants (Abstract) that presents each user with a personalized webpage that displays items such as communities of which the user is a member (col. 7, lines 6-12). The Office

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

Action asserts that the Herrero reference and Vogt patent are analogous art because both are from the field of community/project management.

The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the Herrero reference with a virtual community communications system that presents personalized webpages, as taught by Vogt, because this modification allows community participants to more readily share and access their own and others contributions.

The Office Action stated, for Claim 13, the combination of the Herrero reference and Vogt patent teaches: A system as claimed in claim 12, wherein said home page is configured such that users can access all tasks which they have permission to access from their respective home pages (Herrero, [0034], lines 1-3)

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of Claims 12 and 13 because neither the Herrero reference nor Vogt patent, whether alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose each and element of Claims 12 and 13. Claims 12 and 13, however, should be allowable at least because these claims are dependent upon Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request that this Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

E. Response to the Third Section 103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejected Claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Herrero reference in view of U.S. patent no. 6,058,395 issued to Buzaglo, et al.

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

The Office Action stated, for Claim 16, the Herrero reference teaches “A system as claimed in claim 1.” The Office Action acknowledges that the Herrero reference fails to disclose the limitation “further comprising chat means which allows users who have permission to access a task to chat to one another when they are logged onto the system at the same time.”

The Office Action, however, stated the Buzaglo patent discloses a communication system for managing a community of participants for a multidisciplinary project (Abstract) that allows a user to chat with other participants in a project who are concurrently online (col. 7, lines 57-61). The Office Action asserts that the Herrero reference and Buzaglo patent are analogous art from the field of community/project management.

The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the Herrero reference with a virtual community communications system including real-time chat feature, as taught by Buzaglo, because this modification allows community participants to quickly apprise other participants of their status and to make inquiries/requests of others.

The Office Action stated, for Claim 17, the combination of the Herrero reference and Buzaglo discloses: A system as claimed in claim 16, wherein each task page has means for initiating a chat (Buzaglo, col. 7, lines 57-61, disclosure of system providing means for initiating chat with other on-line project participants).

The Office Action stated, for Claim 18, the Herrero reference teaches “A system as claimed in claim 1.” The Office Action acknowledges that the Herrero reference fails to disclose the limitation

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

“wherein said task creator is configured to allow specification of a lifetime for a task whereby during said lifetime a user who selects the task uri is directed immediately to the task page and outside said lifetime said user is required to confirm their identity.”

The Office Action, however, stated the Buzaglo patent discloses a communication system for managing a community of participants for a multidisciplinary project (Abstract) that allows for administrator configurable authorization schemes for project participants (col. 6, lines 41-49).

The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the Herrero reference with a virtual community communications system including user authorization controls, as taught by Buzaglo, because this modification allows for implementation of security controls for both the project and user accounts.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of Claims 16-18 because neither the Herrero reference nor Buzaglo patent, whether alone or in combination, teach, suggest or disclose each and element of Claims 16-18. Claims 16-18, however, should be allowable at least because these claims are dependent upon Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request that this Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 16-18 be withdrawn.

F. Request for Examiner Interview

Applicant respectfully requests that a personal interview be promptly scheduled between Applicant’s attorney of record, Richard C. Gilmore, and Examiner Williams so that the pending claims, cited references and distinctions between the pending claims and cited references can be

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

discussed in more detail. Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner Williams contact Applicant's attorney of record to schedule an interview at the Examiners earliest convenience.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that Claims 1-18 are allowable over the cited references and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be promptly issued.

If any further impediments to allowance of this application remain, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned by telephone so that these remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

Re. : Amendment and Response to Office Action Mailed on January 9, 2008
Appl. No. : 10/569,338
Filed : February 21, 2006

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication, which have not otherwise been paid, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178. If any additional extension of time is required, which have not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 9, 2008

By: /Richard C. Gilmore/
Richard C. Gilmore
Registration No. 37,335
Attorney of Record

Customer No. 22,913

WORKMAN, NYDEGGER

1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 533-9800
Facsimile: (801) 328-1707
E-mail: rgilmore@wnlaw.com

1917326_1